Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2000

SCORE	Request #	Agency	Project Title	GTCF Request	Match	Total Cost	State Gov't Council Recommendation
63	2000-13	DAS - IMServices	Lotus Notes Collaboration Research and Test Environment	$ 50,000.00	$ 92,660.00	$ 142,660.00	$ 50,000.00
61	2000-12	DAS - IMServices	Generic Internet Licensing Application	$151,440.00	$ 38,400.00	$ 189,840.00	$ 151,440.00
57	2000-09	UNL - Conservation and Survey Division	Creating Digital Access and Archiving of the Conservation and Survey Division Aerial Photography Collection	$ 32,300.00	$ 8,500.00	$ 42,800.00	$ 32,300.00
56	2000-02	Crime Commission	NCJIS Enhancement	$ 62,000.00	$ 21,000.00	$ 83,000.00	$ 62,000.00
55	2000-07	Fire Marshal	Web-Based Applications	$112,543.20	$ 28,135.80	$ 140,679.00	$ -
53	2000-01	Nebraska Arts Council	E-granting conversion project	$ 41,000.00	$ 26,700.00	$ 92,700.00	$ 41,000.00
50	2000-03	Dept. of Revenue	Common Business Identification Number	$ 50,000.00	$ 12,500.00	$ 62,500.00	$ 50,000.00
50	2000-14	Foster Care Review Board	Transition from Macintosh to IBM compatible computers	$ 58,684.45	$ 14,679.49	$ 73,363.94	$ -
47	2000-05	Board of Engineers & Architects AND Board of Geologists	Licensee Renewal Process	$ 6,000.00	$ 2,000.00	$ 8,000.00	$ -
46	2000-10	Dept. of Natural Resources	Electronic Filing of Water-Well Registrations over the Internet	$ 75,000.00	$ 75,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ -
46	2000-04	Commission on Indian Affairs	Web Site Design, Training & Technical Assistance	$ 55,037.00	$ 14,900.00	$ 69,937.00	$ -
46	2000-11	Grain Sorghum Board	Technology Enhancement	$ 11,840.50	$ 3,613.50	$ 14,454.00	$ -
45	2000-08	Fire Marshal	Incident Response Reporting and Tracking	$105,400.00	$ 38,158.00	$ 143,558.00	$ -
44	2000-06	Volunteer Service Commission	Web Based Report System	$ 2,839.99	$ 2,839.99	$ 5,679.98	$ -
			TOTALS	$814,085.14	$379,086.78	$ 1,219,171.92	$ 386,740.00

Recommendation to the NITC
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2000

The State Government Council, at their meeting on June 8, 2000, reviewed the 14 applications for funding from the Government Technology Collaboration Fund and recommended that the following projects be funded, with certain conditions:

Request # 2000-01   **$41,000.00**
Nebraska Arts Council
E-granting conversion project

> Condition for the applicant:
> 1. Create a steering committee, with representatives from at least three other agencies which manage grants (e.g. HHS, University of Nebraska, Crime Commission, Dept. of Education), to aid in the review and selection of an electronic grant application.

Request # 2000-02   **$62,000.00**
Crime Commission
NCJIS Enhancement

Request # 2000-03   **$50,000.00**
Department of Revenue
Common Business Identification Number

Request # 2000-09   **$32,300.00**
UNL - Conservation and Survey Division
Creating Digital Access and Archiving of the Conservation and Survey
Division Aerial Photography Collection

> Condition for the applicant:
> 1. Provide a briefing to the GIS Steering Committee on this project.

Request # 2000-12   **$151,440.00**
DAS - IMServices
Generic Internet Licensing Application

> Conditions for the applicant:
> 1. Establish a steering committee of participating agencies.
> 2. Coordinate efforts with Nebraska Online.
> 3. As part of the requirements analysis, include the other agencies which submitted GTCF applications relating to licensing (Dept. of Natural Resources and Board of Engineers & Architects/Board of Geologists).
> 4. After completing Phase 1 (Analysis) and prior to expending more than $53,040 of grant funds, provide a report to the State Government Council including the results of the analysis and a plan for any further expenditures.

Request # 2000-13   **$50,000.00**
DAS - IMServices
Lotus Notes Collaboration Research and Test Environment

                                            TOTAL   **$386,740.00**

Application Reviews

Request # 2000-01

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Nebraska Arts Council	E-granting conversion project	$41,000.00	$26,700.00	$41,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Arts Council is requesting funds to facilitate its grant application and review process by developing an **e-granting system**. To implement this system, the NAC would purchase e-granting software, a new server and ADSL line dedicated to the e-granting process, to enable organizations to submit grant applications electronically. The e-granting software will automatically transfer data from electronically filed applications to the agency's grants management database, and will eventually allow the agency to manage the entire application and review process electronically. This would drastically simplify the application process for nonprofit organizations requesting grant funds, and would allow the agency to re-allocate staff resources to other agency priorities. The NAC will work with schools, libraries, and higher education institutions to ensure Internet access for all applicants.

Background:
The NAC annually processes between 400 and 500 grant applications, submitted by schools, churches, and nonprofit organizations across the state. The applications go through a review process that includes an evaluation of the proposal by either a private citizen who has volunteered to be a grant reviewer, or by a panel of citizens who assemble at a public meeting to review grants. Currently, applicants submit from three to 18 hard copies of the application and attachments; this requires considerable time to assemble their grant application packets, and often represents a considerable investment for copying and mailing.

NAC staff must enter application information into the grants management database, collate the grants into books for panel reviews, and send the applications to panelists two to three weeks prior to the public grant panel review meeting. Panelists receive boxes containing up to 35 grant applications to read and assess, and must bring all the applications to the panel meeting in Omaha.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs	0	0	15,000	0	15,000
Contractual Services					
- Programming	10,000	0	0	0	10,000
- Project Management	0	0	5,500	0	5,500
- Other	0	0	1,500	0	1,500
Telecommunications	0	0	1,200	0	1,200
Training (for staff and grantees)	15,000	0	0	0	15,000
Other Operating Costs	0	0	1,500	0	1,500
Travel	0	0	2,000	0	2,000
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition	15,000	0	0	0	15,000
- Software Acquisition (incl. $10,000 in consultant fees)	0	0	0	22,500	22,500
- Other (incl. ADSL line)	1,000	0	0	2,500	3,500
Total Project Cost	41,000	0	26,700	25,000	92,700

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**11**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**8**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**8**	10
VI.	Implementation	**8**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**10**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**2**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**7**	10
	TOTAL	**53**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:

- The goal of ensuring Internet access for all applicants seems beyond the scope of a single agency and should seemingly be addressed as a broader NITC/SGC activity. They can point out current options to grant applicants (such as libraries, etc) but they seemed t target a much larger hope.
- There is a lot of discussion of interfacing the e-granting software with the current system but neither the current system nor the interface is clearly defined. There is a need for more explanation.
- The lack of information on the interface limits the ability to assess the impact on the agency. There is a mention that agencies must now copy forms if downloaded but an e-granting system would probably put that load on the NAC (unless the intent is to go entirely paperless, but that is not stated). It sounds like the 'e-granting' program would allow entities to submit applications online while the interface would be to an internal grants management system (used for review, tracking, etc). Information does not fully describe how that would affect grant review or grant management but the ability to submit applications online can be beneficial if the NAC can adapt its own procedures.
- Lack of information on the internal grant system as well as not knowing about the potential e-granting systems leaves questions about the development, maintenance and support costs for the interface.

Reviewer #2:

- One of the goals that the project states that it obtains is to ensure that all potential applicants have access to the Internet to participate in the e-granting process. This project provides some of that potential, however, I did not see where they had buy-in from the libraries for training on how to use this product and therefore, they may not have that level of commitment out there.
- It is my opinion that there would be a much stronger case for this project if we were addressing e-granting on a statewide basis instead of specific to one agency.
- Agency did not do a cost/benefit analysis. Estimates are vague and simply that, estimates.
- Although no formal sponsor was identified, it is assumed that the agency will be the sponsor. Maintenance and on-going support are identified as being the problem of the software provider and contractors. There is no plan for internal support that is necessary with any automation project.
- I don't understand the $2,000 in travel. They also show a line of $1,200 for Telecommunications and another $3,500 for an ADSL line.

Reviewer #3:

- Disk capacity seems a bit low and may need to expand

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Approve the request, with the following condition: Create a steering committee, with representatives from at least three other agencies which manage grants (e.g. HHS, University of Nebraska, Crime Commission, Dept. of Education), to aid in the review and selection of an electronic grant application.

Request # 2000-02

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Crime Commission	NCJIS Enhancement	$62,000.00	$26,700.00	$62,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project proposes to expand access and functionality to the NCJIS server from state maintained databases to local agency databases. The NCJIS server is a secure browser based Internet access point for criminal justice agencies to use central criminal justice databases. NCJIS (Nebraska Criminal Justice Information System) is the result of a cooperative project involving state and local agencies to improve the access, availability and sharing of data. This project proposes to build upon the ongoing working relationship between local agencies and the CJIS Advisory Committee with two goals: adding soundex capability for name matching and allowing agencies to access local law enforcement records management systems.

Soundex is a technology that compares similar names or spellings for matches (e.g. Smith and Smythe). NCJIS currently allows agencies to do exact matches on names but soundex is a very useful tool to broaden the scope of investigations and matching used by criminal justice professionals. The sharing of case data across jurisdictions can be valuable in solving cases, finding links across cases, identifying serial criminals or crimes through patterns, and in providing proper identification. Currently there is limited sharing of data across jurisdictions. Some agencies have established county systems (spanning police and sheriffs) or have built links with other close agencies. However, crime and criminals are not just local. Technology now allows us to build systems for users of disparate systems to share data. By being able to look at arrest, contact, property and similar types of case record data from other jurisdictions there is greater possibility in solving crimes that span those jurisdictions. Crime has become less of a local event as criminals have easier mobility.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs		$10,000.00			$10,000.00
Contractual Services					
- Design		$5,000.00			$5,000.00
- Programming	$32,000.00				$32,000.00
- Project Management		$6,000.00			$6,000.00
Capital Expenditures					
- Software Acquisition	$30,000.00				$30,000.00
Total Project Cost	$62,000.00	$21,000.00			$83,000.00

Soundex Software Acquisition: $30,000 (estimated by MTG Management Consultants)
Local Data Access: $7,000 Lincoln/Lancaster Co, $20,000 Kearney/Buffalo Co, $5,000 Lincoln Co

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**10**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**8**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**8**	10
VI.	Implementation	**8**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**9**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**6**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**8**	10
	TOTAL	**56**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS
Reviewer #1:
- This is actually two distinct projects. It would have been better to evaluate them on their individual merit and not as a combination.
- No information available concerning the ongoing maintenance costs of the Soundex software, nor the extract programs.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Approve the request.

Application Reviews

Request # 2000-03

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Department of Revenue	Common Business Identification Number	$50,000.00	$12,500.00	$50,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project is to study the feasibility of merging North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code information from the Nebraska Department of Labor with the sales tax files maintained by the Nebraska Department of Revenue. The reason for merging this data is to provide the Department of Revenue with the best and most current business classification information that can be used by citizens, businesses and local governments to track retail sales by geographical area and by business classification.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Contractual Services					
- Other Study	50,000		12,500		62,500
Total Project Cost	50,000		12,500		62,500

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**10**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**7**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**7**	10
VI.	Implementation	**5**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**10**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**7**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**6**	10
	TOTAL	**50**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS
Reviewer #1:
- Not enough information was given in the financial analysis and implementation sections to determine if the budget is reasonable.

Reviewer #4:
- I believe there is risk of project failure which should be addressed, even though the feasibility nature of this project means that project failure would not represent a business risk.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Approve the request.

Request # 2000-04

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Commission on Indian Affairs	Web Site Design, Training & Technical Assistance	$55,037.00	$14,900.00	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Commission on Indian Affairs (NCIA) came into existence on April 7, 1970, when Governor Norbert Tiemann issued an Executive Order creating the commission. In 1971, the Eighty-Second Legislature voted to designate it a permanent State agency. Its primary purpose is to serve as an advocate agency for Nebraska tribes and Indian organizations. It maintains a 14-member commission with representatives from the four tribes, major urban areas and at-large appointments.

The Commission proposes to accomplish three objectives: (1) Establish a web site that will provide comprehensive information on the commission for end-users. (2) Obtain training for NCIA staff and interested commissioners on web site development and management. (3) Provide technical assistance on information technology to Native American communities in Nebraska.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	CTF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel	37,477		7,300		44,777
Contractual Services					
• Design	10,000				10,000
• Project management, evaluation, and quality assurance	3,000				3,000
Telecommunications			4,000		4,000
Supplies and materials	840				840
Other operating			3,600		3,600
Travel	3,720				3,720
TOTAL	55,037		14,900		69,937

Information Technology Specialist @ 100% FTE:
2080 hours x $14.42 per hour $30,000

Fringe Benefits:
FICA @ 7.65% x $30,000 = $2,295
FUTA @ .008 x $7,000   = $56
SUTA @ 3.5% x $7,000   = 245
Work Comp @ .27 per $100 of $30,000 = $81
Health Insurance @ $400 x 12 months = $4,800 $ 7,477

           TOTAL: $37,477

Web Site Design & Development Programming (contracted from a firm like Bellevue Data Communications, Inc., Bellevue, Nebraska) $10,000

Hosting, Maintenance, Support and 2 hrs of Web site updates per month: $250 x 12 months $ 3,000

           TOTAL: $13,000

Application Reviews

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	8	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	6	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	5	10
VI.	Implementation	7	10
VII.	Technical Impact	8	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	6	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	5	10
	TOTAL	**46**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:
- The application states that the primary beneficiary of this project is Nebraska's Native American population, yet objective #1 states that the Web site will be targeted at the non-Indian public. The Web site should also be designed to tie into the technical assistance component and provide general and technical information for Native Americans.
- A significant constraint is having funding for only a one-year technical assistance program. It takes time to hire and train a new person. The project will probably just be taking off at the one-year mark. It is also unclear exactly what the focus of the technical training will be. Will it be setting up computer systems, computer literacy training, e-commerce training, grant researching and writing? It is very difficult for a new person to do all of this from scratch in a one-year period. Having the focus more clearly defined would help in the selection process and would also make it easier for the individual hired to develop or obtain training materials, publicize services, and begin delivering assistance.
- A plan for sustaining the project is needed (perhaps designating individuals from each tribe who would receive additional training so that they would be able to continue providing local assistance).
- I would like to see specific technical assistance deliverables included in the time line. Ongoing support for communities is not addressed.
- NOL should provide Web site hosting for free and may also provide Web site design services. This option should be explored before contracting out these services.

Reviewer #2:
- Not Sure why Nebrask@ Online is not an option for this project, project makes sense, but Online provides training and web-hosting services for free, even if a case for another vendor can be made costs appear high to me.

Reviewer #3:
- Broad objectives are poorly supported by audience directly impacted (and upon which positive assessment expectations are based).
- No business case is made.
- Major weakness is lack of planning regarding accessibility.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.

Request # 2000-05

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Board of Engineers & Architects AND Board of Geologists	License Renewal Process	$6,000.00	$2,000.00	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The purpose of this proposal is to incorporate and automate the license renewal process for the Board of Engineers & Architects and the Board of Geologists by using a barcode scanning system/method to replace keyboard data entry which will increase productivity, efficiency, and accuracy for it's **7,000** licensees. The selected information technology and hardware will be compatible with the current database software, Microsoft Access.

Necessary purchases for this project will include a handheld barcode scanner and appropriate compatible software. The bar code scanning product will perform an automated series of data recall, verification of current status, and entry of essential renewal information on the database. A proposal for development services from Automated Systems, Inc. is included as part of this request.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Contractual Services					
- Design	562.50		187.50		750.00
- Programming	3187.50		1062.50		4,250.00
- Other - Implementation	375.00		125.00		500.00
Training	375.00		125.00		500.00
Other Operating Costs	750.00		250.00		1,000.00
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition (a)	375.00		125.00		500.00
- Software Acquisition	375.00		125.00		500.00
Total Project Cost	6,000.00		2,000.00		8,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**11**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**7**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**6**	10
VI.	Implementation	**6**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**7**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**4**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**6**	10
	TOTAL	**47**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #2:
- Goals of the project are somewhat vague and there is a general belief that automation will be helpful but there is no real savings specified in the application.
- The application did not specify looking at any other alternatives to the bar coding which I feel they should have done to be assured this is the proper solution to meet their needs.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.

Request # 2000-06

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Volunteer Service Commission	Web-Based Reporting System	$2,839.99	$2,839.99	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Volunteer Service Commission was created by executive order in 1994 to promote and support national and community service programs in Nebraska. The Commission is directly responsible for two categories of national service programs in Nebraska: AmeriCorps*State and community-based Learn and Serve. Currently the Commission supports 12 AmeriCorps programs with over 150 members. The Commission recently reapplied for a community-based Learn and Serve grant, which for three years in the past supported 10 community-based Learn and Serve programs statewide.

In the fall of 1998, The Corporation for National Service, the source of the Commission's federal funding, initiated a Web Based Reporting System (WBRS) on a pilot basis. The purpose of WBRS is to make program and financial reporting and data tracking easier and more accurate for AmeriCorps programs and state Commissions. Nebraska Commission staff, and AmeriCorps program and financial management staff were trained in the use of the WBRS system in August 1999. Use of the WBRS system became mandatory for all AmeriCorps programs and state Commissions in the fall of 1999. Although the Commission's AmeriCorps programs are currently using WBRS, the three Commission staff members are unable to access WBRS. The WBRS expert, who conducted the training in Nebraska, tried to access WBRS through the Commission's computers and was unable to do so.

The Commission's three computers were purchased in 1994. Two of the computers are Compaq ProLinea 486s with modem speeds of 14.4 Kbps. These two computers are using Microsoft Word Office 6.0. One of the computers, a Dell also with a 486 processor, has been installed with increased memory and an additional hard drive and uses Microsoft Word Office 97. WBRS requires a Pentium PC or better and a modem of at least 28.8 Kbps or higher. Not having access to WBRS has created a real problem for program staff at the Commission and for the national service programs, for which the Commission is responsible. Since Commission staff does not have WBRS access, they are unable to approve program information, financial information and member data directly on the web. Staff have to wait for hard copies of the information and cannot correct or approve information that is being sent directly to the Corporation for National Service. This has created a number of problems for the program staff. In addition, because of the capacity of our computers and the older software (Microsoft 6.0 on two of the computers), the staff is not able to download much of what is being sent to them on e-mail. Often e-mails have to be sent requesting that information be sent via fax. To correct this problem and to allow us to do what our federal funder expects of us, the Commission office needs three computers with a capability of an Intel ll processor or better and modem speeds of at least 28.8 Kbps or higher.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Funds	Match (federal funds)	Total
Three computers	$2,130.00	$2,130.00	$4,260.00
Microsoft Office 2000 (2 copies)	$549.99	$549.99	$1,099.98
Microsoft Office Upgrade	$160.00	$160.00	$320.00
TOTAL	$2,839.99	$2,839.99	$5,679.98

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	9	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	5	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	8	10
VI.	Implementation	3	10
VII.	Technical Impact	9	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	5	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	6	10
	TOTAL	44	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS
Reviewer #2:
- The narrative failed to address specific implementation issues.
- There is not much risk to acquiring 3 PCs with web capabilities.

- The budget is based on HP brand computers purchased from Best Buy. State agencies must use the state's contract for PCs. This insures quality and compatibility. The budget does not reflect costs for either separate phone lines for the modems or Internet service. Connection to the state's network is also an option that should be considered in the future, which would require a LAN card.

Reviewer #3:
- No detailed measurement or assessment methods have been suggested. For example on page 4 "The additional hours can be spent in site visits to Americorps prgrams..." could suggest a pre- and post- analysis of site visits and determine if the additional technology will actually free up staff time and allow more site visits.
- No mention was made of a project implementation team or their roles or responsibilities. No implementation timeline or milestones were provided. Training, staff development, maintenance, and on-going support requirements should be detailed.
- The application mentions modem speeds several times but no mention or analysis was made with respect to a network or its feasibility.
- Computer prices seem reasonable. MS Office Pro 2000 price through GE Capital is $336.53 for new install; $214.47 for upgrade.

Reviewer #4:
- Low risk project to upgrade office computing environment to allow utilization of Web-based reporting system.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.

Request # 2000-07

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Fire Marshal	Web-Based Applications	$112,543.20	$28,135.80	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

It is the goal of the State Fire Marshal to make the agency more efficient by improving work methods which will save time and money. This will be accomplished by networking the agency which will allow all employees access to the databases which are now on stand-alone PCs, providing all employees with Internet access to provide a quicker and more effective means to communicate with all staff, redesigning our website so we can better provide information the public needs, and developing new databases that are accessed through web-based applications written in Visual Age for Java. These databases and web-based applications will simplify the work process, improve turnaround time and cut agency costs.

Funding is being requested to purchase network cards to finish connecting staff in the Lincoln Office to the token-ring network, a server and software which will be housed at IM Services, provide dial-up Internet access to all staff outside the Lincoln Office, redesign of our website, and the analysis phase of the web-based applications.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs			$ 28,135.80		$ 28,135.80
Contractual Services					
- Design	$ 81,474.00				$ 81,474.00
Telecommunications	$ 5,000.00				$ 5,000.00
Capital Expenditures0					
- Hardware Acquisition (a)	$ 11,934.49				$ 11,934.49
- Software Acquisition	$ 12,434.71				$ 12,434.71
- Network	$ 1,700.00				$ 1,700.00
Total Project Cost	$ 112,543.20		$ 28,135.80		$ 140,679.00

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**11**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**8**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**8**	10
VI.	Implementation	**8**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**8**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**5**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**8**	10
	TOTAL	**55**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS
Reviewer #1:
- The agency seems to be trying to do everything on the Internet in one fell swoop (aside from the internal networking). Since this is new for them it is probably better to do some things incrementally while adjusting their broad goals over time. The analysis stage does not seem to have an implementation phase or sureness of funding so it could be good to both analyze, design and implement some of the applications up front. (One section of the application says that funding is only requested for analysis but other places refer to implementation so I am assuming, perhaps incorrectly, that this is their long range plan.)
- Developing the broad range of web-based applications will have a large impace on the agency and their clients. The impact on workload will probably be significant and have substantial impacts and outcomes.
- Elimination of a position does not usually happen, even if projected.

- There is no mention of an email client, system or costs so it is presumed they will use a free email client and DOC email facilities. Some of the web applications deal with interaction and entry by local fire agencies and the public; this raises more sever security issues than internal use.
- The potential impact on procedures seems far more significant than addressed in application. The assumption of full funding for application development puts the spending of all of analysis money up front at risk.

Reviewer #3:
- SFM has submitted a request to fund a general office automation plan. The bulk of the request is for funds to complete the planning and design process, with additional revenue to purchase equipment necessary to implement the project. The request details the business practices that are to be addressed. The application, however, suffers from an inadequate financial plan. First, the application states that "we will find additional funding to complete the development." Second, the application refers to "significant cost savings" in postage, printing, personnel, elimination of duplication of effort, and time saved for the office and the SFM clients. An adequate financial plan should (1) identify these savings, (2) identify those specific applications from among the list of 54 items which provide the greatest return on investment, and (3) create a compelling business case to support the quest for "additional funding to complete the development."
- The SFM has done an excellent job in identifying the tasks to be automated, and the request to fund the actual design of the SFM's office system is detailed and well documented. This reviewer is confident that the design effort would be completed within the confines of the application request. An adequate financial plan would reduce the risk of implementation.

Reviewer #4:
- They know what they want to do but I am not sure that all the details have been worked out.
- This project does not jive with IM Services direction towards more Lotus Notes databases. It seems to me that the Fire Marshall should investigate.
- I am concerned about the vague IM Services cost estimates, It seems like a quick and dirty analysis of what it will take to accomplish the tasks outlined.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.

Request # 2000-08

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Fire Marshal	Incident Response Reporting and Tracking	$105,400.00	$38,158.00	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Agency requires all emergency response organizations (State Statute 81-506 states all fire departments must report all fires responded to) to report fire emergencies, and because of this requirement, is introducing a new reporting system and supportive software. This project would provide the necessary software to the emergency response organizations and provide them with sufficient training to submit these required reports in a timely period. This project will also provide the necessary training, supported with laptop computers purchased with these grant funds for the software training and use, to use the software correctly and efficiently. This project will further promote the cooperative effort of other State Agencies/Divisions that also require reporting on emergency incidents, namely the Health and Human Services System-EMS and the University of Nebraska-Nebraska Forest Service; and show the efforts of all State organizations to reduce or virtually eliminate redundancy in required state reporting.

The project will provide a grant program for those emergency response organizations to receive funding to purchase the necessary software or retroactive grant payment to those who have already started the process of implementing the new reporting system. In conjunction with this software grant program, options would be provided for additional software program levels to be purchased which would assist the organizations with other necessary documentation that enhances the overall data collection and statistical analysis completed by State Agencies, such as training records, personnel records, apparatus, equipment, and budgeting issues.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs			15,600.00		15,600.00
Training (Student)			3,692.00		3,692.00
Other Operating Costs			1,160.00		1,160.00
Travel			17,706.00		17,706.00
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition (a)	30.400.00				30,400.00
- Software Acquisition	75,000.00				75,000.00
Total Project Cost	105,400.00		38,158.00		143,558.00

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**9**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**6**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**7**	10
VI.	Implementation	**6**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**7**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**4**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**6**	10
	TOTAL	**45**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:
- Lack of utilization of present computing capabilities, and serious decline in reporting required statistics indicates need for training and change/process management that clearly is beyond scope of this project.
- Lack of mandated actions, and high potential of non-compliance or disinterest in the field seriously impacts potential benefits.
- Very poorly documented implementation plan. Broad assumptions, significant risks, many open-ended milestones.
- Significant failure in the narrative to address data-sharing strategy. Is this an Internet- or web-based application? How does field share data with central data repository? No documentation verifying compatibility with Federal systems. Security issues are very sketchy.
- Personnel costs undocumented; seem low for multi-year project. No costs included for networking, central database and storage, etc.

Reviewer #3:
- The impact of not implementing the software or implementing it on a smaller scale is not addressed. While it is desirable to have all agencies using the same sofwtare there is no discussion of whether or not this software will meet all of agencies needs or primarily the reporting component.
- The application says the FM can enter data more rapidly but there should be a consideration of electronic submission from local agencies to eliminate double data entry. The role, use and repository information for the data is not clearly described.
- There still seem to be issues with the compatibility with local systems or whether or not this software addresses ALL local needs or is just a reporting package. The security related to email for non-public information should be given more consideration. The use of email may be useful to eliminate paper.
- Acquisition and distribution of standard software is very scalable. The number of packages could be altered to meet available funds. While this needs to be balanced with the investment and commitment to training there can be incremental implementation over time.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.

Application Reviews

Request # 2000-09

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
UNL-Conservation and Survey Division	Creating Digital Access and Archiving of the Conservation and Survey Division Aerial Photography Collection	$32,300.00	$8,500.00	$32,300.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Conservation and Survey Division (CSD), University of Nebraska-Lincoln, houses a large and valuable collection of five to six thousand aerial photographs. The majority of these 9"x9" photographs were taken between the 1930s and 1970s. The aerial photography collection is a critical and widely used resource for natural resource planners, land managers, educators and the general public. In addition, many of the land areas have multiple images spanning different time periods. The spatial and temporal aspects of the aerial photography make for a unique and historically significant collection.

Currently, the collection only exists as hardcopy photographs. The only availability to our clientele is to physically visit our office. When photographs are requested, our only option is to have high quality copies made from the UNL Printing and Duplicating office. The cost of duplication is significant and adds to the handling and wear of the original photography. Due to the age and heavy use of these photographs, a significant portion of the aerial photography collection is rapidly deteriorating. In order to preserve the collection for future users, it is necessary to digitally archive the collection as soon as possible.

With these grant funds, we could acquire the necessary equipment and personnel to scan the photographs and make them easily accessible on-line through the CSD web site. This will not only increase the use and availability to the public but will significantly reduce the wear-and-tear of the collection.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs	$ 17,000.00				
Contractual Services					
- Project Management			$ 5,500.00		
Supplies and Materials	$ 1,000.00		$ 1,000.00		
Training			$ 2,000.00		
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition	$ 14,300.00				
Total Project Cost	$ 32,300.00		$ 8,500.00		$ 42,800.00

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**11**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**9**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**8**	10
VI.	Implementation	**7**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**8**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**5**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**9**	10
	TOTAL	**57**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #2:
- Seems to be a worth while project that will benefit end users and save material for future use.
- Costs appear reasonable and in line with current hardware costs.

Reviewer #3:
- This is a very valid project with a reasonable approach. Low scores in the last few sections simply due to lack of documentation.

Reviewer #4:
- The division presents a compelling justification for the need to digitize it's aerial collection, but it must be remembered that digitization is not a recognized media for permanent records retention. It appears that this application would foster the ability to retain the photos for permanent record retention, and negate the deterioration of the photos, but the agency should develop a process to retain these photos.
- This reviewer could identify little in the discussion on how the records are to be indexed and accessed over the Internet. The application would be strengthened by an analysis of the method by which each single photo would be identified and accessed from among the 5,000 to 6,000 photographs in the collection.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Approve the request, with the following condition: Provide a briefing to the GIS Steering Committee on this project.

Request # 2000-10

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Department of Natural Resources	Electronic Filing of Water-Well Registrations over the Internet	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This proposed project will utilize E-government solutions to automate well registration forms, register water wells, and enhance the process of updating and managing water wells data registered with the Department of Water Resources (Will become the Department of Natural Resources on July 1, 2000). The well owners and drillers will be able to file water well registrations, and update well records over the Internet. The stakeholders will be able to share resources and have interactive access to such information.

Nebraska Statutes, Section 46-602, require water well contractors and owners to register each water well completed in this state within 30 days with the State Department of Water Resources on specified forms and pay a registration fee (up to $100) to the Department.

Section 46-1241, RRS 1943, requires water well owners and contractors constructing a water well to keep an accurate well-log of the construction of each well, and provide such log information to the Department for inspection and record maintenance purposes. The well log information includes a legal description of the water well, names and addresses of well owners and contractors, intended use, depth of geologic materials, pumping rate, well depth and other hydraulic features of the water well.

Currently, the water well registration and permit program is handled manually with resultant inefficiencies in terms of timeliness, program operations, and maintenance and updating of well records. Numerous ownership changes have occurred since the 1960s, some wells have been abandoned or are inactive, and current records do not reflect the changes. In a few instances, well locations are not properly stated. Also, not all water wells are registered with the state. The proposed project will enhance the process of automating the well registration program, and allow well owners, contractors and other stakeholders to have Internet access to such information.

There is interest in the Legislature to authorize the Department of Water Resources to provide for electronic filing of construction-of-water-well forms in the State. LB 1112 was introduced and advanced to the General File in the second session of the 96th Legislature (year 2000).

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs			$ 50,000		$ 50,000
Contractual Services					
- Design	$ 10,000				$ 10,000
- Programming	$ 10,000				$ 10,000
- Data Base Development	$ 5,000		$ 5,000		$ 10,000
- Implementation Process	$ 5,000		$ 5,000		$ 10,000
Supplies and Materials			$ 2,000		$ 2,000
Telecommunications	$ 5,000				$ 5,000
Training			$3,000		$ 3,000
Other Operating Costs	$ 10,000				$ 10,000
Travel			$3,000		$ 3,000
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition (a)	$ 21,000				$ 21,000
- Software Acquisition	$ 9,000		$ 6,000		$ 15,000
- Network			$ 1,000		$ 1,000
Total Project Cost	$ 75,000		$ 75,000		$ 150,000

Software, ArcSDE License	$ 9,000
Hardware Windows NT Platform	$21,000
Data Preparation	$10,000
Process Design and Development	$25,000
Programming, QA/QC Review	$10,000
and Daily Update and Publishing of Data over the Internet	

Application Reviews

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**10**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**6**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**7**	10
VI.	Implementation	**7**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**7**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**4**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**6**	10
	TOTAL	**46**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:
- Broad outcomes are poorly supported by assessment methods (i.e., reduced costs are not supported by counting wells, corrected records, or persons accessing records). Constraints of project are significant- narrative implies that no method for assessing fees has been designed, and that record validation is a significant problem.
- Very poor cost justification/rationale is provided. Failure to show comparison to current costs (over and above what the present registration fee is) was principle reason for low scores in this category.
- Narrative fails to address data validation process, and places burden of fee collection on Sec. of State's process with NOL- yet, provides no insight how the two systems will interact. Legislative intent is irrelevant to project implementation- failure to enact the proposed legislation this past year is not necessarily a positive comment on project's importance.

Reviewer #2:
- This project appears to be a benficial e-government application.

Reviewer #3:

- Application to support electronic water well registration appears to be well founded. The application contemplates using GIS technology to provide both descriptive and GIS location of well. Since this siting of the well is self-reporting, it opens the issue of data accuracy. Will the department be satisfied that the applicant correctly identified the location of the well using GIS coordinates, or will some additional validation be required? This reviewer understands that the application will provide a map to the applicant so the applicant can appropriately identify the location of the well. I also understand that these maps require large amounts of bandwidth to display.
- The documentation indicates that Nebraska Online will collect the filing fee.

Reviewer #4:
- The proposal lists potential beneficiaries, but does not explain how they benefit or what needs are being addressed. The proposal should provide more information about the issues of fee collection and signatures.
- The proposal needs more detailed explanation on nearly every question. The disadvantages of the current manual system should be documented.
- There is no stakeholder analysis. User training is not addressed, which will be important if there are significant changes to workflow and responsibilities. Application maintenance is not addressed. The latter becomes an important issue for interactive applications that require 24-hour support.
- Security is not addressed. The technical solutions for payments and signatures are not addressed. There is no information relating to sizing of equipment in terms of the number of users, the number of filings or the size of the database.
- The need for a separate server for a relatively small application is not explained.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.

Request # 2000-11

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Grain Sorghum Board	Technology Enhancement	$11,840.50	$3,613.50	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Grain Sorghum Board proposes to establish an efficient and effective communications medium which would enhance education and services to producers, merchandisers, end-users, and industry colleagues. Because the Board is comprised only of two employees, time is the most challenging barrier in establishing this communication with producers. Therefore, a web page consultant will be utilized to establish the web site and provide training to staff to ensure web maintenance. The Board proposes to work closely with Nebrask@Online for maintenance assistance and training.

Before a web site can be established, hardware and software upgrades must be in place. Specifically, two PCs, one color inkjet printer, software (graphics/web software), and a scanner. A fax machine is included in the proposal as the current model is obsolete, expensive to maintain, and has poor print quality. As well, a digital camera is included as a key tool in web page development.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs *(1/4 day x $25,000 salary)*	$ 4687.50	$ 1562.50			$ 6250
Contractual Services					
-Design *(web page consultant)*	$ 300	$ 100			$ 400
-Programming *(**included in networking)*	$ 0	$ 0			$ 0
-Project Management *(*included in training/follow-up)*	$ 0	$ 0			$ 0
Telecommunications (existing FAX line)	$ 0	$ 0			$ 0
Training* (*2 persons x 8 classes x $100 p/class)*	$ 1200	$ 400			$ 1600
Capital Expenditures					
-Hardware Acquisition (a)	$ 3265.50	$ 1088.50			$ 4354
-Software Acquisition *(Front Page)*	$ 112.50	$ 37.50			$ 150
-Network** *(through IMS Services)*	$ 300	$ 100			$ 400
-Other *(digital camera)*	$ 675	$ 225			$ 900
Other costs *(USB Hub, cables, Shipping/Handling)*	$ 300	$ 100			$ 400
Total Project Cost	$11840.50	$ 3613.50			$14454

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**10**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**7**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**7**	10
VI.	Implementation	**6**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**8**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**4**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**5**	10
	TOTAL	**46**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:
- Measurement and assessment measures "will be determined". A clear idea of project measurement and assessment should be determined prior to application.
- No projections or cost estimates of postage savings, reduced printing costs, or benefit of automated requests through web-based approach was provided.
- Fax machine replacement and color printer appear as inconsequential to the project and not integral to the project's main thrust. The project requests a 19" monitor rather than a 17" or 15"-- is increased screen size important to the project?

Reviewer #2:
- There is very little supporting statistical information for many of these categories. How much will be saved, how many fewer mailings, etc. Is the information already available?
- The main point of the project is to upgrade hardware/software. There may be alternatives that are not discussed (i.e. The PC with scanner could also work as a fax machine eliminating the need for a new fax machine, Other departments may have digital cameras that can be used for creating pictures.

Reviewer #3:
- The project was not that well defined.
- This proposal seems to me to be something that will take a bit more effort on the part of staff than I think they are currently looking at if they are going to keep this web page fresh and current.
- I would have moderate confidence in this budget because they have not gotten any bid proposals on services to build the web page that I can see. Therefore, this could vary when they get bids to perform this service for them.

Reviewer #4:
- Need for digital camera ($900) is not apparent.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.

Request # 2000-12

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
DAS - IMServices	Generic Internet Licensing Application	$151,440.00	$38,400.00	$151,440.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The goal of this project is to assist State agencies with licensing applicants via the Internet. This project should improve citizen service through collaboration with various state agencies, Information Management Services, and Nebrask@ Online. The beneficiaries of this project will be the State agencies and the individuals and businesses who hold licenses in the State of Nebraska. This approach will allow the State to save dollars and time expended towards Internet licensing by completing analysis, developing generic models, and implementing templates based on the models. This will help the agencies meet the Governor's and the NITC's technical goals since they will be able to support e-commerce and will also have similar programs in place based on a uniform infrastructure.

This project will analyze and document many of the State of Nebraska agencies' licensing requirements using information engineering concepts. The requirements will be compared to find some general models. If Option II is accepted, these models will be used to create standard, portable templates that can be used by the agencies to help them perform licensing over the Internet. These templates will be developed to work on the State's enterprise server, but will be portable so they can work on other standard platforms. If Option III is accepted, a pilot project to implement one of the templates can also be completed.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Option I -- Analysis

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Contractual Services					
- Design	$49,920		$30,000		$79,920
- Project Management	$3,120				$3,120
Total Project Cost	$53,040		$30,000		$83,040

Analysis:
20 hours * $78 to identify agencies that do licensing and the licenses for which they are responsible = $1,560

Assuming one contact for each license, and 50 licenses will be reviewed
Assuming that analyst will charge $78/hr

50 contacts * 3 visits * 2 hours each = 300 hours * $78/hr = $23,400

50 contacts * 3 visits * 2 hours for documentation = 300 hours * $78/hr = $23,400

20 hours * $78/hr to identify similarities between licenses = $1,560

$1,560 + $23,400 + $23,400 + $1,560 = $49,920

Documenting of licensing information learned by Nebrask@ Online into one format would be included within the 50 contacts.
40 hours for project management and reporting * $78/hr = $3,120

In kind match:
Assuming that agencies time is worth $60/hr

Donation of the agencies time for gathering data needed for this effort = 50 * 4 hr = 200 hr * $60/hr = $12,000
Donation of the agencies time for analysis = 50 * 6 = 300 * $60/hr = $18,000
$12,000 + $18,000 = $30,000

Option II – Analysis and Template Development

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Contractual Services					
- Design	$49,920		$36,000		$85,920
- Programming	$82,360				$82,360
- Project Management	$6,240				$6,240
Total Project Cost	$138,520		$36,000		$174,520
Costs from Option I	$53,040		$30,000		$83,040
Additional Costs	$85,480		$6,000		$91,480

Increment Costs for Option II

Implementation:
Assume all costs from Option I will apply to this option

Assume 4 basic models to be designed into templates
Assume that programmer's time will be approximately $71/hr

Assume each model has a logon maintenance screen + reports to see who has applied for licenses =
4 * (20 + 20) = 160 * $71 = $11,360

Assume each model has a data collection piece + way to print current license + way to put data in agency's database + collection of credit card fees
4 * (40 + 40 + 40 + 40) = 4 * 160 = 640 hours for the template * $71 = $45,440

Assume each model has a way to print a license + put/get data in database
4 * (40 + 40) = 4 * 80 = 320 hrs for the template * $71 = $22,720

Development of a standard Internet Licensing WEB page = 40 hours * $71/hr = $2,840

$11,360 + $45,440 + $22,720 + $2840 = $82,360 for the templates

In kind match:
Donation of the agencies time for reviewing the templates = 50 contacts * 2 hours = 100 * $60 = $6,000

Project Management :

40 hours for templates * $78 = $3,120

Option III – Analysis, Template Development, and Pilot Project

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs					
Contractual Services					
- Design	$49,920		$36,000		$85,920
- Programming	$93,720		$2,400		$96,120
- Project Management	$7,800				$7,800
Total Project Cost	$151,440		$38,400		$189,840
Costs from Options I and II	$138,520		$36,000		$174,520
Additional Costs	$12,920		$2,400		$15,320

Increment Costs for Option III

Implementation:
Assume all costs from Option I and Option II

There will be some work unique to each agency. A single pilot project may be chosen in order to provide a proof of concept.

1 license * 80 hours each for making templates unique to the agency * $71 = $5,680

1 license * 80 hours each for making templates unique to the agency * $71 = $5,680

$5,680 + $5,680 = $11,360 for the pilot project

In kind match:
Donation of the contact's time for testing the data collection piece of the model = 20 hours * $60 = $1,200
Donation of the contact's time for testing the licensing side of the model = 20 hours * $60 = $1,200
$1,200 + $1,200 = $2,400

Project Management :
20 hours for pilot project * $78 = $1,560

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	11	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	9	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	8	10
VI.	Implementation	8	10
VII.	Technical Impact	9	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	7	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	8	10
	TOTAL	61	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:
- The risk assessment fails to address a major potential problem, if licensing agencies are unable or unwilling to participate in the project. Before proceeding, the project must develop a strategy for stateholder involvement and acceptance. A project charter defining roles and expectations and a steering committee that includes representatives of affected agencies are examples.

Reviewer #2:
- While it is important for the state to explore all options in this area, several agencies already have online licensing functions in place. This might be done for less money if we piggyback off of development work already done.

Reviewer #3:
- It was unclear whether any agencies have already accpeted this project as a valid project. If so, they probably should have been listed.
- The ongoing maintenance will depend on how much of the project is funded and where it is located so it is pretty open ended at this time.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Approve the request, with the following conditions: 1) Establish a steering committee of participating agencies; 2) Coordinate efforts with Nebraska Online; 3) As part of the requirements analysis, include the other agencies which submitted GTCF applications relating to licensing (Dept. of Natural Resources and Board of Engineers & Architects/Board of Geologists); and 4) After completing Phase 1 (Analysis) and prior to expending more than $53,040 of grant funds, provide a report to the State Government Council including the results of the analysis and a plan for any further expenditures.

Application Reviews

Request # 2000-13

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
DAS - IMServices	Lotus Notes Collaboration Research and Test Environment	$50,000.00	$92,660.00	$50,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The state agencies utilizing Lotus Notes are collaborating to construct a research and testing infrastructure that would empower agencies to share resources and knowledge as well as costs as they explore the potential of using new technologies to improve their business processes. A Research and Testing Lab Steering Committee will be established to set guidelines and coordinate research priorities in the resulting lab environment. The Lotus products under consideration are Domino.doc (a document management tool), Learning Space (a learning tool for geographically dispersed students), and Sametime (a workgroup collaboration and knowledge management tool).

Benefits expected from this collaboration:

- Reduce duplicate hardware/software to do research and testing of value-added software/hardware or new releases of Lotus Notes software
- Provide an opportunity for smaller agencies to explore new technologies
- Provide a centralized infrastructure for research and testing
- Provide a repository for sharing of information on the results of research and testing of software or hardware products
- Demonstrate business collaboration by state agencies
- Provide staff to administrate lab environment and facilitate business feasibility studies.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Option 1: Domino.doc R&T Lab	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Contractual Services					
- Programming -Domino.doc Getting Started Services	9,995				9,995
- Project Management (990hrs) -Yr 1 support staff -Yr 2 support staff -Yr 3 support staff -Yr 4 support staff	7,395			71,805 80,784 82,400 84,048	326,432
Training	1,000				1,000
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition (a) - Netfinity 5510/20 server - Replacement Server in Yr 3	15,000			15,000	30,000
- Software Acquisition -Server license -25 client licenses -Software Mnt for all for Yrs 2-4	14,190 850			12,240	27,280
- Network ($6,360 x 4 yrs) -$115 per mo per svr 1st yr -$115 per mo per svr x 3 yrs -$415 per mo per svr 1st yr -$415 per mo per sgt x 3 yrs	1,380 4,980			4,140 14,940	25,440
	50,000			370,531	420,147

Option 2: LearningSpace and Sametime R&T Lab	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Contractual Services					
- Programming -Getting Started Services for both products	20,995				20,995
- Project Management (990hrs)					326,432

Application Reviews

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
-Yr 1 support staff				79,200	
-Yr 2 support staff				80,784	
-Yr 3 support staff				82,400	
-Yr 4 support staff				84,048	
Training				1,000	1,000
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition (a)					30,000
- Netfinity 5510/20 server	15,000				
- Replacement Server in Yr 3				15,000	
- Software Acquisition					27,897
-Server licenses for both	14,005			935	
-25 client licenses for both				1,200	
-Software Mnt for all for Yrs 2-4				11,757	
- Network ($6,360 x 4 yrs)					25,440
-$115 per mo per svr x 4 yrs				5,520	
-$415 per mo per sgt x 4 yrs				19,920	
	50,000			380,764	431,764

Option 3: Domino.doc and Sametime R&T Lab	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Contractual Services					
- Programming					18,990
- Getting Started Services for both	13,890			5,100	
- Project Management (990hrs)					326,432
-Yr 1 support staff				80,200	
-Yr 2 support staff				80,784	
-Yr 3 support staff				82,400	
-Yr 4 support staff				84,048	
Training				1,000	1,000
Capital Expenditures					
- Hardware Acquisition (a)					30,000
- Netfinity 5510/20 server	15,000				
- Replacement Server in Yr 3				15,000	
- Software Acquisition					36,947
-Server licenses for both	19,860				
-25 client licenses for both	1,250				
-Software Mnt for all for Yrs 2-4				15,837	
- Network ($6,360 x 4 yrs)					25,440
-$115 per mo per svr x 4 yrs				5,520	
-$415 per mo per sgt x 4 yrs				19,920	
	50,000			389,809	439,809

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	**11**	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	**9**	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	**9**	10
VI.	Implementation	**9**	10
VII.	Technical Impact	**10**	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	**7**	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	**8**	10
	TOTAL	**63**	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #2:

- I believe that there is one constraint that is not defined and that is the issue of time of the participants. With all of Government doing more with less, the opportunity for an agency to participate in this type of project is governed by the time they are allowed to participate outside of the normal functions of their job.
- Looks like a great deal of money that will need to come from other funding sources. Getting agency buy-in will be critical. However, truly a collaborative project and one that is worth exploring fully!

Reviewer #3:
- Measurement and assessment should include an evaluation of user satisfaction with the project. Also, agency participation is a key constraint, and the willingness of agencies to submit to the discipline of a shared environment is a key assumption.
- The project proposal does not address two key risks. One is the possibility that not enough agencies agree to participate to justify the project. Also a shared test environment imposes some constraints on individual users and creates the potential for conflict among users.

Reviewer #4:
- Excellent project.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Approve the request.

Request # 2000-14

Agency	Project	Request	Match	State Gov't Council Recommendation
Foster Care Review Board	Transition from Macintosh to IBM compatible computers	$58,684.45	$14,679.49	$0

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Foster Care Review Board (FCRB) requests funds necessary for the completion of the transition from Macintosh to IBM compatible computers. The Foster Care Review Board consists of three supervisory regions: Omaha, Lincoln, and Rural Nebraska. Last year the Technology Collaboration Fund Grant enabled the FCRB to equip the Omaha region with IBM compatible computers; however, the agency requests additional funds to complete the overall project.

There is a current need for 15 additional IBM compatible computer systems for Lincoln and Rural Nebraska staff and one laptop for the new position of Program Coordinator. Four staff members have older printers which will need to be replaced for compatibility. New IBM/Mac compatible printers for the rest of the staff were purchased last year to accommodate the transition; however, IEEE printer cables will be needed for all 16 systems.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs		$2500.00	$466.14		$2,966.14
Telecommunications	$6120.00		$4,320.00		$10,440.00
Training		$1440.00			$1440.00
Travel		$2000.00	$310.00		$2310.00
Capital Expenditures					
-Hardware Acquisition (a)	$37,016.66		$3,643.35		$40,660.01
-Software Acquisition	$15,547.79				$15,547.79
-Network					
-Other					
Other costs					
Total Project Cost	$58,684.45	$5940.00	$8,739.49		$73,363.94

(a) Itemized Equipment
```
Computers               15 @ $1968.00 = 29,520.00
Laptop                   1 @ $3000.00 =  3,000.00
HP LaserJet 8100         1 @ $2468.87 =  2,468.87
PGP                     37 @ $ 149.00 =  5,513.00
Office 2000 cd           3 @ $  18.44 =     55.32
Office 2000 licenses    16 @ $ 336.53 =  5,384.48
Office 2000 upgrade     16 @ $ 214.47 =  3,431.52
Adobe Publisher          1 @ $ 800.00 =    800.00
Printers                 5 @ $ 150.99 =    750.00
Printer Cables IEEE     21 @ $  54.99 =  1,154.79
Modem                    1 @ $ 123.00 =    123.00
23 ISPs for 12mo       276 @ $  20.00 =  5,520.00
Omaha ISP                1 @ $  50.00 =    600.00
Training                16 @ $  90.00 =  1,440.00
Installation                          =    731.20
Mileage for Installation              =  2,000.00
                                      $ 62,492.18
```

PROJECT SCORE

		Score	Maximum Possible
III.	Goals and Objectives	12	12
IV.	Scope and Projected Outcomes	8	10
V.	Project Justification / Business Case	8	10
VI.	Implementation	5	10
VII.	Technical Impact	8	10
VIII.	Risk Assessment	4	8
IX.	Financial Analysis and Budget	5	10
	TOTAL	50	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:
- Encryption technology is essential to insure private communications, but the project will not achieve this in most cases. Board members without encryption software would not be able to exchange secure e-mail with staff. Also, exchanging encrypted e-mail with HHS staff would require additional steps that are not reflected in the grant application.
- Many of the costs in the proposed budget seem to go beyond the stated objectives of replacing aging Macintosh computers with PCs and implementing an encrypted email system. The inclusion of printers and ISP expenses indicate that a general upgrade of computing equipment and capabilities is a third objective, which is not addressed or justified in the grant application. Using existing printers as in-kind match for the project is questionable.

Reviewer #2:
- This reviewer is concerned about the encryption software being chosen. The concern is around the issue of not having any experience with PCP software as an encryption tool. Additionally, there continues to be a concern about spending money on the Macintosh computers that it appears will be replaced in the near future.
- This particular project will assist the agency in supporting their state and federal mandates, however, the project is not in itself a mandate.
- I did not see any documentation or mention of stakeholder acceptance. It appears as if the responsibility for this entire project lies with one person. There are not timeframes for milestones or deliverables mentioned.
- ISP costs appear to be under represented. 23 ISP for 12 months at $20 per month seems unreasonable. There is a line for telecommunications for $10,440 but only $6,120 are identified in ISP costs. What are the rest?

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

Do not fund.